

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO	
10/645,339 08/21/20		08/21/2003	Hans-Peter Kampfer	22638	7590	
535	7590	09/30/2004		EXAMINER		
THE FIRM	1 OF KA	RL F ROSS	REIFSNYDER, DAVID A			
5676 RIVE	RDALE A	VENUE				
PO BOX 900				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
RIVERDALE (BRONX), NY 10471-0900			1723			

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\mathcal{C}$			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7,			
	10/645,339	KAMPFER, HANS-PETER				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	David A Reifsnyder	1723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply y within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH:	y be timely filed  30) days will be considered timely.  S from the mailing date of this communicati	on.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 A	uaust 2003					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the						
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 August 2003</u> is/are:	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object	ted to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Extension 11.			(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Appl ity documents have been rec (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mary (PTO-413)				
P) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  B) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/21/03.		ail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Patent and Trademark Office	<del></del>					

Application/Control Number: 10/645,339

Art Unit: 1723

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2 214 841 A in view of Yohe.

Regarding claims 1-11; GB 2 214 841 A discloses a hydrocyclone body made up in three sections cobalt cemented tungsten carbide wear resistant material.

Regarding claims 1-11; GB 2 214 841 A fails to disclose that his cobalt cemented tungsten carbide wear resistant material comprises other carbides such as titanium, tantalum or chromium in a metallic binder comprising nickel and chromium.

Regarding claims 1-11; Yohe discloses a cemented wear resistant material of tungsten carbide, other carbides such as titanium, tantalum or chromium in a metallic

Application/Control Number: 10/645,339

Art Unit: 1723

binder comprising cobalt, nickel, iron and other metals. It is considered that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the other metals in Yohe's cemented wear resistant material be chromium since chromium is a common metal and Yohe already has chromium carbide as a part of his wear resistant material.

Regarding claims 1-11; it is considered that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for GB 2 214 841 A to have substituted his wear resistant material for Yohe's wear resistant material as it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.* 

Furthermore, regarding the instantly claimed particle sizes, densities and hardness, bearing any unexpected criticality of the particle size, density or hardness; it is considered that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used particles of any desired size, hardness and density.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A Reifsnyder whose telephone number is (571) 271-1145. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda M Walker can be reached on (571) 272-1151. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/645,339

Art Unit: 1723

Page 4

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David A Reifsnyder
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1723

DAR